



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,662	11/26/2003	Keith Goclawski	02-065-KG	5143
7590 LAMBERT & ASSOCIATES SUITE 200 92 STATE ST BOSTON, MA 02109		11/13/2008	EXAMINER MUSIASZEK, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT 3625	PAPER NUMBER PAPER
			MAIL DATE 11/13/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/722,662  
Filing Date: November 26, 2003  
Appellant(s): GOCLOWSKI, KEITH

---

Adam J. Bruno  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 8/18/2008 appealing from the Office action  
mailed 9/26/2007.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

5,774,873	Berent et al.	6-1998
6,449,601	Friedland et al.	9-2002
2002/0046148	Alaia et al.	4-2002

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berent et al. in view of Friedland et al., and further in view of Alaia et al.

**(10) Response to Argument**

Appellant's arguments with respect to the teachings of the Alaia reference have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. Initially, appellant asserts that Alaia discloses an extension feature, thus rendering it "inapplicable as prior art." However, the Examiner notes that the auction timer feature claimed also serves as an auction extension feature. That is, if a higher bid is submitted in a claimed auction, the auction timer is reset, thus extending the total time of the auction. Accordingly, appellant's argument to this point is not valid.

Appellant further asserts that Alaia simply does not disclose the claimed auction timer feature. However, as disclosed in at least paragraph [0040] and figures 6A-6D, Alaia discloses (as claimed in claim 1) an auction timer that controls the time left in an auction and is read out to display the time remaining in the auction (see figures: "CLOSING TIME"). If a new "best bid" (equivalent to claimed higher bid) is received within a certain interval from the closing time, the closing time is automatically reset for a time one minute later, for example. Such resetting behavior is equivalent to the features recited in claim 3. Accordingly, Alaia does indeed disclose the claimed auction timer.

With regard to appellant's arguments that the claimed invention allows bids to be received that will reset the auction timer at any point in the auction, as opposed to the interval disclosed by Alaia, the Examiner notes that such features were not claimed, and the scope of the claims does not require such features.

Appellant also asserts that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the prior art references. However, the Examiner notes that all three of the prior art references are in the same specific field of endeavor as the present application, remote electronic auctions. Accordingly, the cited prior art references are considered to be analogous art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system, as taught by Berent, with the features taught by Friedland and Alaia, since such a modification would have only united elements of the prior art references, with no change in their respective functions and which yield predictable results.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey A. Smith/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 3625

**Conferees:**

/Michael A. Misiaszek/

Michael A. Misiaszek  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3625

/J. A. S./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3625

Vincent Millin /VM/

Appeals Practice Specialist